

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-14 and 16-27 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 8, 14, 16-18 and 21 are amended and claims 2 and 15 are canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter found therein. No new matter is added. Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6 and 8-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0012121 to Yamamoto in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,479,485 to Hayashi and rejects claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yamamoto in view of Hayashi and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,286,012 to Kindo et al. (Kindo). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts, *inter alia*, that Yamamoto discloses a communication apparatus that includes slave units which may request data from a remote center and which are allowed to receive and store such data (see page 3, paragraph 5 of the Office Action).

Contrary to the assertion of the Office Action, Yamamoto does not disclose the slave unit 6 requesting content data. Rather, in Yamamoto, including the section referenced in the Office Action, the portable terminal 7 receives content data directly and sends the data to the device body 20 (master unit) (see [0062], [0073]-[0079] and [0080]). This functionality is not attributed to a slave unit. As such, the Office Action has inappropriately mapped the functions of the portable terminal 7 with the slave unit 6 (see [0074]).

Further, Yamamoto does not disclose a communication apparatus "wherein when one of the plurality of slave units makes a request to the remote center for transmitting the data, only the one of the plurality of slave units of the communication apparatus that makes the request is allowed to receive and store therein the entire contents of the data transmitted from the remote center," as recited in claim 1 or "when one of the plurality of slave units makes the request, the control circuit prohibits the master unit from storing the entire contents of the

data transmitted from the remote center and further prohibits other ones of the plurality of slave units from receiving and storing therein the data transmitted from the remote center," as recited in claim 8. In fact, to the extent that Yamamoto addresses storage of the data between the facsimile apparatus 100, the cordless slave unit 6 and/or the portable terminal 7, Yamamoto suggests that all data would be available within the browsing and electronic mail function unit 1 (see paragraph [0062]). Yamamoto does not teach, disclose or suggest that sent data from the facsimile apparatus 100 would not continue to be available in the browsing and electronic mail function unit 1. In other words, Yamamoto fails to disclose the feature of only the one of the plurality of slave units of the communication apparatus that makes the request is allowed to receive and store therein the entire contents of the data transmitted from the remote center. Further, it is not inherent in the method of operation of the communication apparatus disclosed by Yamamoto that the information already provided is no longer stored in the facsimile apparatus 100. The browsing and electric mail function unit 1 (a part of the master unit) stores therein all of the content data (see [0062]). Such a configuration teaches away from the subject matter of the pending claims that limits distribution based on the requestor.

The Office Action asserts that Hayashi remedies the deficiencies of Yamamoto by disclosing that only the one of the plurality of slave units that makes a request to a remote center is allowed to receive and store the data transmission from the remote center (see page 3, paragraph 5 of the Office Action). Applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion.

Hayashi discloses a facsimile apparatus 1 connected to a telephone line 6 with a main body 2 and a remote unit 3. Hayashi further discloses that the main body is provided with a telephone/facsimile apparatus automatic switching function that detects communication arriving on the telephone line and determines whether the communication is a facsimile signal. If the signal received is not a facsimile signal, then the voice communication request


signal is transmitted to the remote unit 3 (see, e.g., col. 1, lines 31-42 and col. 1, line 53 - col. 2, line 19, as cited in the Office Action in paragraph 5). Hayashi does not disclose or suggest the transmission and storage of the "entire contents of the data transmitted from the remote center" to any of the remote units. Rather, Hayashi only discloses that voice data is transmitted from the base unit to the remote units. Therefore, Hayashi does not teach, nor can it reasonably be considered to have suggested, a system in which either "only one of a plurality of slave units of the communication apparatus that makes the request is allowed to receive and store therein the entire contents of the data transmitted from the remote center," as recited in claim 1 or an apparatus which "prohibits the master unit from storing the entire contents of the data transmitted from the remote center and further prohibits other ones of the plurality of slave units from receiving and storing therein the data transmitted from the remote center," as recited in claim 8, and the similar features recited in claims 14 and 21.

Therefore, neither Yamamoto nor Hayashi, either alone or in combination, teach, disclose or suggest all of the features claimed in independent claims 1, 8, 14 and 21 of the present application. For at least this reason, claims 1, 8, 14 and 21 are patentably distinct from the applied prior art. Further, the claims depending from claims 1, 8, 14 and 21, to include claim 7 as Kindo does not overcome the deficiencies of the base combination applied to claim 1, are also allowable for the reasons discussed, as well as for the additional features recited therein. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 3-14, and 16-27 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,


James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

James E. Golladay
Registration No. 58,182

JAO:JEG/hms

Date: August 3, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
